

### **REMARKS**

Applicants are canceling non-elected Claims 1-6 herewith, without prejudice to filing a divisional application on such claims at a later date.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 11, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

While this rejection is respectfully traversed, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended Claims 11, 16 and 21 to more clearly claim the invention of the present application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102**

The Examiner also rejects Claims 7-8, 10, 12-13, 15, 17-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Okumura, US2003/0032222. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While this rejection is respectfully traversed, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 7, 12 and 17 to add the limitation "reflecting the synthesized laser beam by at least one mirror." As shown in the figures and discussed in the specification of the present application, in the present invention, at least one mirror is used to control the direction of the synthesized laser beam since after synthesizing a plurality of laser beams,

it is difficult to change the direction of the synthesized laser beam.

Applicants respectfully submit that Okumura fails to teach or suggest this feature. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejected claims are patentable over the cited reference, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 11, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okumura in view of Arney et al. (U.S. 4,749,364). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these rejected claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above for the independent claims, the rejected dependent claims would be patentable over these cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### New Claims

Applicants are adding new Claims 22-31 herewith. Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 if any fee is due for these claims.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are preparing an information disclosure statement (IDS) which they will file in the very near future. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to any further action being issued on this application.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 16, 2004

  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500